

## REMARKS

Claims 6 and 7 have been amended. Claims 6-8 are now pending and Applicant respectfully requests consideration of claims in light of the following remarks.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103

#### Claims 6-8


Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Houde et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,978,678) in view of Hammer et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0166403) and Koster (U.S. Pat. 6,259,914 B1). Claim 6 has been amended to clarify the invention and claim 7 has been amended accordingly amended.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for discussing the main differences between the instant application and the Koster reference during the telephone interview on June 12, 2007. As pointed out during the interview, Koster fails to disclose that the MSC assigns the virtual origination number. The amendments to the claims are believed to further clarify the distinctions made during the telephone interview.

Claim 6, as amended, recites a method of providing a wireless communication service to a first country roaming mobile station in which once a first country roaming station is registered at a MSC in the second country, the second country MSC receives a routing request message, determines whether the routing request message is for an international call, and if so further generates an international routing number for the first country roaming mobile station. The second country MSC also receives a virtual origination number from a HLR in the second country and assigns the first country roaming mobile station the virtual origination number when a call origination request is received.


The method of the present invention operates on a system that is different than the system disclosed by Koster and claim 6 has been amended to clarify the differences. The figures shown below illustrate the differences between the present invention and Koster.

The following figure represents how the virtual origination number of the present invention is assigned to the first country mobile station by the second country MSC:



In the present invention, when a first country mobile station attempts to register with a second country MSC, the second country MSC communicates with the first country HLR to determine if the first country mobile station has international service. If the first country mobile station has international service, the first country HLR sends the second country MSC the information necessary to communicate with the first country mobile station. As a second country HLR has already provided the second country MSC a virtual origination number to use, the second country MSC can assign the already provided virtual origination number to the first country mobile station when the first country mobile station originates a call, as recited in the claims. Neither the first country HLR nor the second country HLR assigns the virtual origination number to the first country mobile station. Rather, the second country HLR provides virtual origination numbers to the second country MSC, which then assigns the virtual origination numbers to mobile stations from the first country.

The following figure illustrates how the mobile directory number of Koster is assigned by International Roaming Station HLR to the first country mobile station:



Koster discloses that when a first country mobile station attempts to register with a second country MSC, the second country MSC checks with an International Roaming Service HLR that is located in the second country. (Fig. 1, Col. 5, lines 32-41) If the first country mobile station has international service, the International Roaming Service HLR associates a Mobile Directory Number ("MDN") with the first country mobile station and transmits an acknowledgement including the MDN to the second country MSC (Col. 6, lines 8-17). The Patent Office has taken the position that the NANP-formatted MDN reads on the "virtual origination number." Acknowledgement of international service and assignment of the MDN is provided solely by the International Roaming Service HLR. When the first country mobile station originates a call in the second country, the second country MSC uses the mobile directory number assigned to first country mobile station by the International Roaming Service HLR (Col. 6, lines 33-38). The second country MSC does not assign a MDN to the first country mobile station.

The International Roaming Service HLR is located in the second country (Fig. 1) and must include information about the first country mobile station to recognize that the first country mobile station has international service (Col. 5, lines 31-38). At the time of registration of the first country mobile station with the second country MSC, a HLR in the first country is not contacted because the International Roaming Service HLR already knows whether the first country mobile station has international roaming service. This requires roaming agreements under which the first country HLR

continually provides subscriber information to the International Roaming Service HLR. An International Roaming Service HLR having this complicated arrangement of shared information is not required by the present invention.

Claim 6, as amended, clarifies the differences between the present invention and Koster. Koster fails to disclose or suggest that the second country MSC receives a virtual origination number from a HLR in the second country, as required by the claims. Koster also fails to disclose or suggest that the second country MSC assigns the already provided virtual origination number to the first country mobile station, as required by the claims.

Additionally, Koster teaches that the International Roaming System HLR maps the original MIN to the MDN (col. 3, lines 45-47), which means that the MDN is based on the MIN. The virtual origination number of the present invention is assigned by the second country MSC, as recited in the claims, and is not "mapped" by any HLR.

The combined references cited by the Patent office thus fail to render obvious the invention of claim 6 as now presented. Accordingly, allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 8, which depend from claim 6, are patentable for the same reasons as discussed above.

#### Claim 6

Claim 6 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Houde et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,978,678) in view of Kunz (U.S. Pat. 5,353,340) and Koster (U.S. Pat. 6,259,914 B1).

Kunz was cited solely for teaching the generation of an intra-foreign service exchange number. Kunz does not cure the lack of teachings in the other patents regarding the subject matter of independent claim 6. Accordingly, the combined references cited by the Patent Office thus fail to render obvious the invention of the claims as now presented and allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Houde et al., Hammer et al., Koster and Kunz is respectfully requested. Since all

objections and rejections have been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such a notice is solicited.

A Petition for a three-month extension of time is enclosed. Authorization is given therein to charge the \$1020 fee to Deposit Account No. 17-0055. No other fees are believed to for consideration of this response, however, authorization is hereby given for any additional fees to be charged to that deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

JIN-HONG KIM

Dated July 3, 2007

By:



Jeremy J. Westlake  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No. 57,470  
Quarles & Brady LLP  
411 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4497  
Tel. No. (414) 277-5723